

most part in the late civil war ; because,, even though it may be true that the Southern view of the subject was historically unsupported, and by consequence that the people of the States which seceded were really in rebellion, yet the great majority of them did not think so themselves, but on the contrary held most stoutly and honestly to the dogma that their States were alone entitled to their allegiance,---that is, that their States were really nations, each possessed of full sovereignty. There were, it is true, in the Border States, considerable communities which adhered to the Union, as in West Virginia and East Tennessee. But in the other portions of these States and in the Cotton States, there was n substantial unanimity of opinion and action,

2. It follows from the above considerations that, in writing this history, it is not necessary to prefix to the military narrative an account of the causes of the war. We may, with perfect propriety, deal with our subject exactly as if we were undertaking to describe a war between two nations. If the movement in the South had been prosecuted as a rebellion, strictly BO called, in the interest of the slave-owners, the case would be different. Then, we certainly should be obliged to give some account of the nature and extent of the grievances alleged by the

rebels, in
order that we might be able to estimate
correctly the
strength of the disloyal party. But we do
not have
to deal with that case.

It is no doubt true, and in fact it has
never bcum
questioned, that, had slavery not existed,
tint Cotton
and Gulf States would not have seceded ;
and, if they